

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,274	02/09/2004	Antonio Fernando Melo e Silva	3411	
759	90 06/21/2006		EXAMINER	
Antonio Fernando Melo e Silva			LIOU, JONATHAN	
Rua da Circulaca	ao			
150 - Lousado			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
V.N. Famalicao, PORTUGAL	4760-621		2616	
TORTOGAL			DATE MAILED: 06/21/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	,	1	٩
•		Z	۲

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/774,274	MELO E SILVA, ANTONIO FERNANDO	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jonathan Liou	2663	

	Jonathan Liou	2663					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 14 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o se with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	s of the date of e appeal. Since				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered by	ecause				
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> </ul>	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);					
(c)   ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	PTOL-324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		inpliant / infortation	( , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>10</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>11</u> .							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ied.				
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)					

## Continuation of 3. NOTE:

Applicant cancelled claims 1-9, and claim 10 is amended. From the amendment filed on 2/14/2006 by application, there is no attempt to correct the issues raised either in the final office action or last advisory action. Thus, Examiner maintains the same ground of rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101, 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph.

An examination of this application reveals that applicant is unfamiliar with patent prosecution procedure. While an inventor may prosecute the application, lack of skill in this field usually acts as a liability in affording the maximum protection for the invention disclosed. Applicant is advised to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or agent to prosecute the application, since the value of a patent is largely dependent upon skilled preparation and prosecution. The Office cannot aid in selecting an attorney or agent.

A listing of registered patent attorneys and agents is available on the USPTO Internet web site http://www.uspto.gov in the Site Index under "Attorney and Agent Roster." Applicants may also obtain a list of registered patent attorneys and agents located in their area by writing to the Mail Stop OED, Director of the U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

During examinination of this application, it appears to Examiner that Applicant does not seem to clearly distinguish the difference between the Utility patent and Design patent. The application appears to be more proper to file as the design patent rather than utility patent. In general, the utility patent must at least satisfy the 35 U.S.C. 101 and 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph. 35 U.S.C. 101 states that "Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title." Applicant's design of Cool Wave is abstract and ornamental article look design. Thus, it does not meet the requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101 statutory. The definition of Design patent is following:

The desgin patent could be applied for the invnetion, which is new, original and ornamental design for an article of manufacture. Applicant's Cool Wave could be belong to ornamental design.

In a design patent application, the subject matter which is claimed is the design embodied in or applied to an article of manufacture (or portion thereof) and not the article itself. In addition, it is not to the design of an article, but to the design for an article, and is inclusive of ornamental designs of all kinds including surface ornamentation as well as configuration of goods." In re Zahn, 617 F.2d 261, 204 USPQ 988 (CCPA 1980).

The design for an article consists of the visual characteristics embodied in or applied to an article.

Since a design is manifested in appearance, the subject matter of a design patent application may relate to the configuration or shape of an article, to the surface ornamentation applied to an article, or to the combination of configuration and surface ornamentation.

Design is inseparable from the article to which it is applied and cannot exist alone merely as a scheme of surface ornamentation. It must be a definite, preconceived thing, capable of reproduction and not merely the chance result of a method.

In view of the above discussion, the amendment after final will not be entered with reasons set forth in 3(a) and 3(c). For the purpose of appeal, the status of the claims are as follows:

- 1. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The geometric figure itself is not considered as a useful process in order to have any functional utilities. The drawing per se as claimed is considered as an abstract design figure; thus, it is not statutory. Furthermore, the abstract drawing should not be applied for Utility Patent because it does not meet the statutory conditions.
- 2. Claim 10 is rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.
- 3. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. This claim is an omnibus type claim.
- 4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 10 lack disclosing the invention features and the claims should not be solely based on drawing.

Claim 11 is not entered and withdrawn from consideration.

RICKY Q. NGO SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER